

**18:** 113, 1916). In my recent revision of the *Malvaceae* for the Flora of Panama (Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. **52:** 497-578, 1966) I considered *Peltaea* as a section of the genus *Pavonia* Cav. (p. 528); this agrees with the opinion of many recent authors, among others Standley (Jour. Wash. Acad. Sci. **17:** 168, 1927; Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **27:** 255, 1928), Uittien (Rec. Trav. Bot. Néerl. **33:** 770-772, 1936), and Kearney (Amer. Midl. Nat. **46:** 107, 1951; Leaflet West. Bot. **7:** 122, 1954 & **8:** 225, 1958). It is, however, not my purpose to discuss here the generic delimitation within the genus *Pavonia* s.l., but only to call attention to the species *Pavonia sessiliflora* H. B. K. (*Peltaea sessiliflora* (H. B. K.) Standley). This species has been misinterpreted by many authors, among others Gürke (in Mart., Fl. Bras. **12** (3): 492, 1892), Standley (Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **18:** 113, 1916 & **27:** 255, 1928), Uittien (loc. cit. 772), Kearney (loc. cit., 1954 & 1958), and myself (loc. cit. 530), who described the mericarps as being glabrous. In fact, as pointed out by Krapovickas and Cristóbal (loc. cit. 174), these are "cubiertos de pelos simples, rígidos" (see also the original description, H. B. K., Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. **5:** 287, 1822). The Panamanian collections, with glabrous mericarps, should rather be referred to *Pavonia trinervis* (Presl) A. Robyns, comb. nov.; *Malachra trinervis* Presl, Rel. Haenk. **2:** 126, 1835; *Peltaea trinervis* (Presl) Krap. & Crist., Kurtziana **2:** 168, 1965; *Pavonia sessiliflora* sensu A. Robyns, Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. **52:** 530, 1966, non H. B. K. (Nov. Gen. Sp. Pl. **5:** 281, 1822).—*André Robyns, Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis.*

### HIBISCUS LUTEUS (ROLFE) L. O. WILLIAMS & A. ROBYNS, COMB. NOV. (MALVACEAE)

In a recent paper A. Robyns (Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. **52:** 176-181, 1965) called attention to the genus *Wercklea* Pittier & Standley and pointed out that the characters given by Pittier and Standley to separate this genus from *Hibiscus* L. do not in fact serve adequately to distinguish *Wercklea* from *Hibiscus*. Consequently he reduced *Wercklea* to synonymy and provided two new names: *H. rolfeanus* A. Robyns for *W. lutea* Rolfe and *H. wercklei* A. Robyns for *W. insignis* Pittier & Standley, because earlier homonyms existed.

The name *H. luteus* does indeed appear in the literature, but is not validly published; it is only cited as a synonym, "*H. luteus* Pavon in Hb. (ined.)," by Hochreutiner in his revision of the genus *Hibiscus* (Ann. Conserv. Jard. Bot. Genève **4:** 88, 1900) under *H. brasiliensis* L. var. *luteus* Hochr. The specific epithet *rolfeanus* is thus superfluous and the new combination should read: *Hibiscus luteus* (Rolfe) L. O. Williams & A. Robyns, comb. nov.; *Wercklea lutea* Rolfe, Kew Bull. **1921:** 118, 1921; *Hibiscus rolfeanus* A. Robyns, Ann. Missouri Bot. Gard. **52:** 177, 1965, nomen illegitimum.—*Louis O. Williams, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois and André Robyns, Missouri Botanical Garden, St. Louis.*